



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,435	09/27/2001	Daniel Blaukopf	P-3601-US	8777

7590

01/04/2005

ROBERT C. KOWERT
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/963,435

Applicant(s)

BLAUKOPF ET AL.

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1> Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 3> Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldred et al, U.S Patent No. 5,719,942 ["Aldred"] in view of Lahr, U.S Patent Publication No. 2001/0029525 A1.

- 4> Aldred discloses a method of communicating function calls or event notification between two applications [column 12 «lines 44-51»], said method comprising passing an event port number and a command port number from a first application to a second application [column 1 «lines 61-67» | column 6 «lines 20-26» | column 7 «lines 44-53» | column 8 «lines 63-66»] where: Aldred's basically discloses establishing channels between a first and second application. The channels may be of different types depending on the ports that are established as the channel's endpoint and Aldred discloses both event and command ports and ports numbers.]

Aldred does not specifically disclose that the port numbers are stored in a memory accessible to the second application.

5> Aldred does disclose storing a customization file in a repository, the file containing configuration and start-up options as well as information relating to physical links. Lahr discloses a configuration file that includes port addresses accessible to the client application [paragraphs 0043, 0044]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Lahr's configuration file into Aldred for the obtained advantage of allowing client applications access to port information that is stored in a central location.

6> As claim 12 is merely an article that performs the steps of the method of claim 1, it does not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1, supra.

7> Claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldred and Lahr, in further view of Simonoff et al, U.S Patent No. 6,005,568 ["Simonoff"].

8> As to claim 2, Aldred does not explicitly disclose the method comprising the second application connecting a TCP/IP client socket to the event port.

Art Unit: 2152

9> Connecting a TCP/IP socket to a port is well known and expected in the art. For example, Simonoff discloses establishing a socket connection on a given port [column 8 «lines 63-65» | column 10 «lines 13-27»]. In addition, it is well known in the art that sockets are commonly defined in part by a port address. Therefore, as Aldred discloses event ports as endpoints to the two-way communication channel, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that TCP/IP socket functionality would have been included in Aldred's system.

10> As to claim 3, Aldred does not explicitly disclose the method comprising connecting a TCP/IP client socket to the command port.

11> Connecting a TCP/IP socket to a port is well known and expected in the art. For example, Simonoff discloses establishing a socket connection on a given port [column 8 «lines 63-65» | column 10 «lines 13-27»]. In addition, it is well known in the art that sockets are endpoints of a two-way communication link and are commonly defined in part by a port address. Therefore, as Aldred discloses command ports as endpoints to the two-way communication channel, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that TCP/IP socket functionality would have been included in Aldred's system, and specifically, that establishment of the TCP/IP socket would connect to both ports located on either end of the channel.

Art Unit: 2152

12> As to claim 4, Aldred does not explicitly disclose the method storing the connection parameters of either client socket.

13> Lahr discloses storing the connection parameters of streams between applications [paragraph 0043]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Lahr's parameter storage functionality into Aldred's system to allow connection parameters of Aldred's channels and ports to be stored in a central location.

It is well known in the art that sockets are endpoints of a two-way communication link and are commonly defined in part by a port address. Therefore, as Aldred discloses event ports as endpoints to the two-way communication channel, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that TCP/IP socket functionality would have been included Aldred and Lahr's system, and specifically, that the Lahr's stream connection parameters (IP address, bandwidth, ports) would be applied to client sockets.

14> As to claim 5, Aldred discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising passing a function reference value through the command port connection [column 24 «lines 52-61»].

15> As to claim 6, Aldred discloses the method of claim 3, further comprising passing a function parameter through the command port connection [column 24 «lines 39-42»].

Art Unit: 2152

16> As to claim 8, Aldred discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising passing an event notification tag through event port connection [column 31 «line 59» to column 32 «line 67»].

17> As to claim 9, Aldred discloses the method of claim 8, further comprising checking the event port for an event notification tag [column 25 «lines 23-27» | column 30 «lines 48-51» where: the command initiates monitoring for events at the port].

18> As to claim 10, Aldred discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising checking the command port in response to receiving an event notification tag [column 25 «line 53» to column 26 «line 10»].

19> As to claim 11, Aldred discloses the method of claim 9, passing through the event port connection an event port notification tag relating to the completion of a function [column 37 «lines 1-9»].

20> As to claims 13-17 and 19, as they are merely articles that perform the steps of the method of claims 2-6 and 8, respectively, they do not teach or further define over the limitations of claims 2-6 and 8. Therefore, claims 13-17 and 19 are rejected for the same reasons set forth for claims 2-6 and 8, supra.

Art Unit: 2152

21> Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Aldred, Lahr and Simonoff, in further view of Jalili et al, U.S Patent No. 5,423,042 ["Jalili"].

22> Simonoff does disclose the method of claim 5 further comprising passing a value of memory location [column 36 «lines 34-37»] but does not specifically disclose storing a result of a function trigger by the passing of the function reference value.

23> Jalili discloses passing a value of a memory location for storing result of a function trigger by the passing of the function reference value [abstract | column 10 «lines 33-48»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Jalili's memory location for storing results of functions into Simonoff's pointer functionality to communicate to the second application where to store the results of a function.

24> As claim 18 is merely an article that performs the steps of the method of claim 7, it does not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 7. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 7, supra.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner